



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,049	06/08/2001	Nino R. Vaghi	T3379-907561	9037
34610	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP			ELAHEE, MD S	
P.O. BOX 221200			ART UNIT	
CHANTILLY, VA 20153			PAPER NUMBER	
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/876,049	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAGHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Md S Elahee	<b>Art Unit</b> 2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/23/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11,40-42,70-89 and 107-134 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11,40-42,70-89 and 107-134 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed 08/23/04. Claims 1-11, 40-42, 70-89 and 107-134 are pending. Claims 12-39, 43-69 and 90-106 have been cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 40-42, 70-89, 107 and 108 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the added limitation at this time.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 112 recites the limitation "the processor" in page 11, line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 118 recites the limitation "the authorization" in page 12, line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 119 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 112.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2645

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-7, 11, 40, 41, 70-74, 77-79, 109-120 and 122 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864).

Regarding claims 1 and 40, Hansson teaches receiving a call on a mobile communications unit (i.e., wireless phone) (abstract; fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29).

Hansson further teaches connecting the call from the mobile communications unit to a hard-wired terminal (i.e., telephone), wherein the connecting step is automatically performed by connection management software programmed into the mobile communications unit in response to receiving the call (abstract; fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 7-29, col.6, lines 4-7, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 2 and 78, Hansson teaches connecting the hard-wired telephone to only receive calls through the wireless phone (abstract; fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 3, Hansson teaches generating inherently an artificial dial tone when a receiver of the hard-wired telephone is activated.

Regarding claim 4, Hansson teaches connecting the hard-wired telephone to receive calls through a public-switched telephone network (fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 5, Hansson teaches that the connection management software sends a ring signal to the hard-wired telephone when the call is received by the wireless phone (fig.1; col.11, lines 3-13).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 6 and 73, Hansson teaches detecting inherently a hook-state signal indicating that a receiver of the hardwired telephone has been activated (fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 7-29, col.6, lines 4-7, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11).

Hansson further teaches connecting the call to the hard-wired telephone based on inherently detection of the hook-state signal (fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 7-29, col.6, lines 4-7, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 7 and 74, Hansson teaches inherently detecting termination of the call based on a hook-state signal indicating that the receiver of the hard-wired telephone has been de-activated (fig.1; col.11, line 14-col.12, line 13).

Regarding claim 80, Hansson teaches that the connector of the interface unit is connected to a plurality of hard-wired telephones, and wherein a processor of the interface unit controls to which of the hard-wired telephones the call is to be sent (fig.1A; col.3, lines 40-67, col.4, lines 1-10).

Regarding claims 10 and 77, Hansson teaches automatically inherently de-activating a microphone and speaker of the wireless phone when the call is connected (col.5, lines 12-29).

Regarding claims 41 and 71, Hansson teaches the wireless device is one of a wireless phone (fig.1, element 102).

Regarding claim 70 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Hansson teaches a cellular telephone 102 (i.e., wireless device) including a serial communications interface 717 (i.e., voice communications port) (fig.7).

Art Unit: 2645

Hansson further teaches a battery charger 123 (i.e., interface unit) including a serial communications interface 715 (i.e., connector) which couples (i.e., mates) with the serial communications interface 717 of the cellular telephone (fig.7; col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 72, Hansson teaches means for determining when the connector of the interface unit mates with the voice communications port of the wireless device (fig.7; col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 79, Hansson teaches that the interface unit includes a battery re-charger for the wireless device (fig.7; col.16, lines 31-34).

Regarding claims 109 and 111, Hansson teaches means for determining when the connector of the interface unit mates with the voice communications port of the wireless device (fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29).

Regarding claims 110 and 112, Hansson teaches that the processor automatically performs inherently the conversion in response to a detection signal indicating that the wireless phone is connected to an interface unit between the wireless phone and hard-wired telephone (fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 113, Hansson teaches that the connection management software receives inherently a mode signal from the determining means indicative of the mating, and then automatically converts an operational mode of the wireless device to interface mode for connecting calls between the wireless device and hard-wired telephone (fig.1, 7; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 114, Hansson teaches inherently a stud on the interface unit (fig.7).

Hansson further teaches a function button on the wireless device which is inherently activated by contact from the stud when the voice communications port of the wireless device is mated with the connector of the interface unit (fig.1, 7; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 115, Hansson teaches inherently a first electrode on the interface unit and a second electrode on the wireless device (fig.7).

Hansson further teaches that the second electrode inherently contacts the first electrode when the voice communications port of the wireless device is mated with the connector of the interface unit, and then sends a mode signal to the connection management software for connecting calls between the wireless device and hard-wired telephone (fig.1, 7; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 116, Hansson teaches that a detector which detects when the voice communications port of the wireless device mates with the connector of the interface unit, and then sends a mode signal to the connection management software for connecting calls between the wireless device and hard-wired telephone (fig.1, 7; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 117, Hansson teaches that the detector is located in the wireless device (fig.1, 7; col.16, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 118, Hansson teaches that the authorization information includes at least the wireless phone user dialed number (i.e., telephone number) (fig.1; col.8, line 23-col.9, line 2, col.11, lines 4-13).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 119 and 122, Hansson teaches that the processor re-configures the wireless communications unit to receive a call at a different wireless phone user telephone number when different authorization information is received inherently through the keypad (fig.1; col.8, line 23-col.9, line 2, lines 23-35, col.10, lines 1-11, 32-35, col.11, lines 1-13).

Regarding claim 120, Hansson teaches that the processor re-configures the wireless communications unit in response to inherently activation of a mode button (fig.1, 7; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 12-29, col.10, lines 1-11, 32-35, col.11, lines 1-13, col.15, lines 6-35).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of DePani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,714).

Regarding claim 8, Hansson teaches dialing a telephone number on the hard-wired telephone (fig.1; col.10, lines 32-35, col.11, lines 1-3).

Hansson further teaches detecting the dialed telephone number (fig.1; col.8, line 23-col.9, line 2, col.10, lines 32-35, col.11, lines 1-13).

Hansson fails to teach "confirming validity of the dialed telephone number". DePani teaches confirming validity of the dialed telephone number (fig.4; col.11, line 66- col.12, line



Art Unit: 2645

16). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow confirming validity of the dialed telephone number as taught by DePani. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide authentication of the party.

Hansson further fails to teach “automatically connecting the call through a wireless service provider if the dialed telephone number is valid (fig.4; col.11, line 66- col.12, line 16). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow automatically connecting the call through a wireless service provider if the dialed telephone number is valid as taught by DePani. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to connect the call to the cellular telephone.

Regarding claim 9, Hansson fails to teach “determining whether a number of digits in the dialed telephone number equals a predetermined number of digits corresponding to a valid telephone number”. DePani teaches determining whether a number of digits in the dialed telephone number equals a predetermined number of digits corresponding to a valid telephone number (fig.4; col.11, line 66- col.12, line 32). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow confirming validity of the dialed telephone number as taught by DePani. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to determine authorized user.

9. Claims 11 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Pfundstein (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,920).

Regarding claims 11 and 88, Hansson fails to teach “authorization information stored on a smart card”. Pfundstein teaches authorization information stored on a smart card (fig.2; col.3, lines 36-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow authorization information stored on a smart card as taught by Pfundstein. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the identity of the mobile subscriber.

10. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Fuentes (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,810).

Regarding claim 42, Hansson fails to teach “the wireless device is connected to the hard-wired telephone by a wireless connection”. Fuentes teaches that the mobile station (i.e., wireless device) is connected to the landbased telephone station (i.e., hard-wired telephone) by a radio channel (i.e., wireless connection) (fig.1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow the wireless device being connected to the hard-wired telephone by a wireless connection as taught by Fuentes. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide radio communication.

11. Claims 75 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of DePani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,714) and further in view of Kweon (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,922).

Regarding claim 75 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 8. Furthermore, Hansson in view of DePani does not specifically teach “a buffer which stores a telephone number dialed on the hard-wired telephone”. Kweon teaches that a buffer which stores a telephone number dialed on the hard-wired telephone (fig.1; col.3, lines 16, 17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson in view of DePani to allow a buffer which stores a telephone number dialed on the hard-wired telephone as taught by Kweon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the temporary storage of the dialed number.

Regarding claim 76 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 8 and 75.

12. Claims 81, 82, 84 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Fintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,580).

Regarding claim 81 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 70. Furthermore, Hansson fails to teach that the interface unit includes a plurality of connectors which mates with the voice communications ports of a respective plurality of wireless devices. Fintel teaches the docking station (i.e., interface unit) includes a plurality of connectors which mates with the voice communications ports of a respective plurality of wireless devices (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 1-6). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate the interface unit including a plurality of connectors which mates with the voice communications ports of a respective plurality of wireless devices as taught by Fintel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide communication with a plurality of wireless devices.

Regarding claim 82, Hansson teaches a call is sent to the hard-wired telephone through one of the connectors (fig.1, 7; col.5, lines 12-29, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11, col.16, lines 6-15).

However, Hansson fails to teach a processor which controls activation states of the connectors. Fintel teaches a processor which controls activation states of the connectors (col.4, lines 7-13). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow a processor which controls activation states of the connectors as taught by Fintel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to establish a communication link.

Hansson fails to teach that the processor controls activation states of the other connectors to block calls from being conveyed to the hard-wired telephone through the other connectors. Fintel teaches that the processor controls activation states of the other connectors to inherently block calls from being conveyed to the hard-wired telephone through the other connectors (col.4, lines 1-13, col.6, lines 49-53). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow the processor controlling activation states of the other connectors to block calls from being conveyed to the hard-wired telephone through the other connectors as taught by Fintel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide communication with a particular cellular telephone.

Regarding claim 84, Hansson fails to teach that the interface unit includes a processor which controls a time of activation of the connectors. Fintel teaches that the docket station (i.e., interface unit) includes a processor which controls a time of activation of the connectors (col.5, lines 61-col.6, line 15). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow the interface unit including a processor which controls a time of activation of the connectors as taught by Fintel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide billing information.

Regarding claim 86, Hansson fails to teach that the interface unit includes a graphical interface unit. Fintel teaches that the interface unit includes a display unit 342 (i.e., graphical interface unit) (fig.7; col.8, lines 29-31). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow the interface unit including a graphical interface unit as taught by Fintel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to drive the display through display interface.

13. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Fintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,580) and further in view of Kazemzadeh (U.S. Patent No. 5,642,414).

Regarding claim 83 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 82. Furthermore, Hansson in view of Fintel teaches when a call received, the processor sends a missed-call signal to the hard-wired telephone when the call sent to the hardwired telephone is terminated. Kazemzadeh teaches when a call received, the processor sends a missed-call signal to the hard-wired telephone when the call sent to the hardwired telephone is terminated (col.1, lines 39-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson in view of Fintel to allow to allow the processor sends a missed-call signal to the hard-wired telephone when the call sent to the hard-wired telephone is terminated when a call received as taught by Kazemzadeh. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to restrict the caller's ID from the called party.

14. Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Fintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,580) and further in view of Numminen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,687,499).

Regarding claim 85, Hansson in view of Fintel teaches “allows a user to manually control an activation state of at least one of the connectors”. Numminen teaches allowing a user to manually control an activation state of at least one of the connectors (col.11, lines 13-15). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson in view of Fintel to allow a user to manually control an activation state of at least one of the connectors as taught by Numminen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to set a connector into a desired position.

15. Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Fintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,580) and further in view of Numminen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,687,499) and further in view of Suikkola et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,195).

Regarding claim 87 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 85 and 86. Furthermore, Hansson in view of Fintel further in view of Numminen teaches “displays information indicative of activation status of the connectors”. Numminen teaches displays information indicative of activation status of the connectors (col.5, lines 23-29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson in view of Fintel further in view of Numminen to allow displaying information indicative of activation status of the connectors as taught by Numminen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to detect the activation data.

16. Claim 89 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Dohrmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,234).

Regarding claim 89, Hansson fails to teach “the interface unit includes a lock”. Dohrmann teaches that the interface unit includes a lock (col.9, lines 21-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to allow the interface unit including a lock as taught by Dohrmann. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide a locking mechanism.

17. Claims 107 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,799) and in view of Lipsit (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,311).

Regarding claim 107, Torrey teaches inherently a keypad (fig.1A, item 130).

Torrey further teaches a handheld wireless communication device 100 (i.e., wireless communication unit) (fig.1A).

However, Torrey does not specifically teach “a memory unit for storing activation information input through said keypad”. Lipsit teaches a memory unit for storing activation information input through the keypad (col.5, lines 40-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Torrey to allow a memory unit for storing activation information input through the keypad as taught by Lipsit. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the temporary storage of the dialed number.

Torrey further teaches a processor for automatically setting the wireless communications unit to receive a call from a wireless service provider (fig.1A; col.2, lines 47-51, col.3, lines 40-67, col.4, lines 1-10).

However, Torrey does not specifically teach “a processor for automatically setting the wireless communications unit at a changeable wireless phone user telephone number, the

Art Unit: 2645

processor automatically setting the wireless communications unit in response to receive the activation information through the keypad”. Lipsit teaches a processor for automatically setting the wireless communications unit at a changeable wireless phone user telephone number, the processor automatically setting the wireless communications unit in response to receive the activation information through the keypad (col.5, lines 40-65, col.6, lines 17-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Torrey to allow a processor for automatically setting the wireless communications unit at a changeable wireless phone user telephone number, the processor automatically setting the wireless communications unit in response to receive the activation information through the keypad as taught by Lipsit. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to assign a new number for a cellular telephone so that it can be activated for a particular cellular service provider in a particular geographic location.

Regarding claim 108 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 107. Furthermore, Torrey teaches a hard-wired telephone including inherently a keypad and a microphone (i.e., a transceiver) (fig.1A, item 130).

Torrey further teaches a handheld wireless communication device 100 (i.e., wireless communication unit) remotely located from the hard-wired telephone (fig.1A).

18. Claim 121 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Eschke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,236).

Regarding claim 121, Hansson does not specifically teach “the processor overwrites the different authorization information over the previously stored authorization information in the memory unit”. Eschke that the processor overwrites the different authorization information over



Art Unit: 2645

the previously stored authorization information in the memory unit (col.1, lines 51-62, col.2, lines 15-27). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate the processor overwriting the different authorization information over the previously stored authorization information in the memory unit as taught by Eschke. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to store an updated information in the memory.

19. Claims 123 and 129-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Mead et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0016164).

Regarding claims 123 and 131, Hansson does not specifically teach “the authorization information includes a user identification code”. Mead that the authorization information includes a user identification code (page 2, paragraph 0017). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate the authorization information including a user identification code as taught by Mead. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the user identification.

Regarding claim 129, Hansson teaches a mobile communications unit (i.e., wireless communications unit) (fig.1).

Hansson further teaches a processor for automatically setting the wireless communications unit to receive a call from a wireless service provider at a changeable wireless phone user telephone number, the processor automatically setting the wireless communications unit based on the telephone number (i.e., authorization information) read by the reader (abstract;

Art Unit: 2645

fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 7-29, col.6, lines 4-7, col.8, lines 23-34, col.9, lines 1, 2, 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11, 28-35, col.11, lines 1-3).

However, Hansson does not specifically teach “a reader that reads authorization information from a removable storage medium”. Mead a reader that reads authorization information from a removable storage medium (page 4, paragraph 0055). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate a reader that reads authorization information from a removable storage medium as taught by Mead. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to verify the user identity from smart card.

Regarding claim 130 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 118.

Regarding claim 132, Hansson teaches that the authorization information includes a serial number (fig.1; col.10, lines 28-35, col.11, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 133, Hansson teaches that the authorization information includes location information (fig.1; col.8, lines 23-34).

Regarding claim 134, Hansson teaches that the authorization information includes information which the wireless service provider or a local exchange carrier needs to activate operation of a wireless phone (fig.1; col.8, line 23-col.9, line 2, col.11, lines 4-13).

20. Claims 124-126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Cervantes (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,433).

Regarding claim 124, Hansson teaches automatically sets the wireless communications unit to receive a call from the wireless service provider at the changeable wireless telephone user number based on said time-of-activation information (abstract; fig.1; col.4, lines 28-32, col.5, lines 7-29, col.6, lines 4-7, col.9, lines 23-26, 32-35, col.10, lines 1-11).

However, Hansson does not specifically that the processor receives time-of-activation information entered through the keypad and receive a call based on the time-of-activation information. Cervantes that the processor receives time-of-activation information entered through the keypad and receive a call based on the time-of-activation information (col.4, line 51-col.5, line 21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate the processor receiving time-of-activation information entered through the keypad and receiving a call based on the time-of-activation information as taught by Cervantes. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide a timer for activation of the feature code so that portable device can receive input signal within a specified period of time.

Regarding claim 125, Hansson does not specifically teach that the time-of-activation information indicates a predetermined daily time schedule. Cervantes that the time-of-activation information indicates a predetermined daily time schedule (col.4, line 51-col.5, line 21, lines 63-67, col.6, lines 1-11). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate the time-of-activation information indicates a predetermined daily time schedule as taught by Cervantes. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide a timer for activation/deactivation of the feature code so that portable device can receive or transmit input

Art Unit: 2645

signal within a predetermined period of time. (Note; since the time period is specified for activation/deactivation, it is inherent that the time-of-activation information indicates a predetermined daily time schedule)

Regarding claim 126 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 124. Furthermore, Hansson does not specifically teach that the processor de-activates the wireless communications unit to receive calls. Cervantes that the processor de-activates the wireless communications unit to receive input signals (i.e., calls) (col.4, line 51-col.5, line 21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate the processor de-activating the wireless communications unit to receive calls as taught by Cervantes. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide a timer for deactivation of the feature code so that portable device can't receive input signal within a specified period of time.

21. Claims 127 and 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/43864) and in view of Lipsit (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,311).

Regarding claim 127, Hansson does not specifically teach "a display for displaying at least one of the changeable wireless telephone user number and said time-of-activation information". Lipsit teaches a display for displaying at least one of the changeable wireless telephone user number and the time-of-activation information (col.8, lines 18-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate a display for displaying at least one of the changeable wireless telephone user number and the time-of-activation information as taught by Lipsit. The

Art Unit: 2645

motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the display for user so that the user can view, edit or delete the entry.

Regarding claim 128, Hansson does not specifically teach "a display, wherein the processor automatically displays information prompting a user to enter the activation information when a handset of the telephone is picked up". Lipsit teaches a display, wherein the processor automatically displays information prompting a user to enter the activation information when a handset of the telephone is picked up (col.8, lines 18-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansson to incorporate a display, wherein the processor automatically displays information prompting a user to enter the activation information when a handset of the telephone is picked up as taught by Lipsit. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the display for user so that the user can program the handset.

### ***Conclusion***

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Raffel et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069014) teach Cordless cellular system and Nakae et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0031651) teach Portable telephone.

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2645

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.,  
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
December 9, 2004



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600